

III. REMARKS

In this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended for formal reasons. Claims 2-20 remain unchanged. In sum, claims 1-20 are pending after entry of this Amendment.

A. Information Disclosure Statement

According to the Office Action, the information disclosure statement filed 9/25/02 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP §609 because some documents were not included in the CD as cited and some have no date. Applicants will address these issues in a subsequent correspondence such as a supplemental IDS, if necessary.

B. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over McCann

Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-20¹ were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,939 to McCann et al. ("McCann"). McCann discloses asking a customer a series of questions to determine a business solution for that customer. More specifically, McCann discloses:

An object-driven application tool allows a Value Added Reseller (VAR) to access a large body of publicly available information about computing devices and to identify the needs of a particular customer or end user and to select an appropriate solution of equipment, hardware, and networking products to meet the customer's needs. Moreover, the tool includes capabilities allowing a VAR to demonstrate to the end user the appropriateness of the solution, for allowing information entry in high level, abstract business-oriented vocabulary rather than a highly technical low level jargon (thus facilitating data entry of information obtained from the end user) and allowing the tool to recognize whether, for example, a slight increase in memory capacity beyond the express needs of the end user may allow a dramatic reduction in requirements for processor speed or non-volatile data storage. The latter tools allow the exemplary embodiment of the present invention to suggest superior solutions over and beyond the express needs of the end user. Selection of a particular solution is generally decoupled from the needs of the end user, which are stored in a separate database; thereafter, as new equipment to obtain on-line information relating to new

¹ Although the text of the Office Action does not list claim 14 as a rejected claim, the Examiner's discussion of the rejection over McCann includes a rejection of claim 14.

products and services. Information in the database also includes retrofit information, so that new products can be installed into existing networks.

McCann Abstract.

McCann does not disclose or suggest “receiving a report instance from a client that has initiated report execution of the report that includes one or more prompt objects,” as recited in independent claims 1, 9, and 16. First, McCann does not disclose or suggest a “report.” In fact, the word “report” does not appear anywhere in the McCann specification.

Applicants’ specification defines a report instance as “an actual execution of a defined report.” Specification, page 2, lines 17-18. The Office Action cites Figure 45 and items 556 and 558 of Figure 45 to teach this element. Figure 45 shows a web page having a sign-on box including a prompt and text field for ID (556) and password (558). This is not “an actual execution of a defined report.” Presumably, the web page is created by the server, so it is not clear what in Figure 45 has been received by and initiated by the client. Regardless, whatever is received by the server and initiated by the client in Figure 45 is not a report instance.

McCann also does not disclose or suggest “gather[ing]...the one or more prompt objects referenced in the report.” The Office Action cites a sign-on button 562 in the login screen of Figure 45 to teach this feature. The sign-on button causes the server to receive the ID and password entered into the web page. The ID and password are merely answers to a prompt, and this action merely involves the transfer of data from one place to another. The ID and password themselves are not prompt objects. They do not each comprise a question to be asked of a user and at least one validation property. Thus, nothing about the sign-on button or the login screen of Figure 45 discloses or suggests gathering prompt objects. Furthermore, any prompts or objects involved in Figure 45 are not related to a report.

McCann also does not disclose or suggest “generat[ing] a resolution object containing the one or more questions from the one or more prompt objects gathered.” The Office Action argues

that the Question Block Base Class 100 and Figures 58A-58V teach this feature. McCann describes the Question Block Base Class 100 as including “a large Base Class of questions that may be posed to a user to identify user preferences.” McCann, col. 23, lines 30-34. Figures 58A-58V show such questions as “Who will be the primary user of this desktop?” Figure 58E.

However, the questions of Question Block Base Class 100 and Figures 58A-58V do not include questions from any prompt object included in report instance. While the Office Action contends that the ID 556 and password 668 prompts are prompt objects of a report instance, the questions of these prompts are not those that are gathered in the Question Block Base Class 100 or Figures 58A-58V. Conversely, the questions in the Question Block Base Class 100 and Figures 58A-58V do not correspond to prompts that are included in a report that is received by the server, as recited in the claims.

Finally, as acknowledged in the Office Action, McCann does not disclose or suggest “executing the report upon receiving answers from a user to the one or more questions in the resolution object.” Office Action, p. 4. The Office Action contends that this step is obvious. *Id.* Applicants contend that this step is not obvious, given that McCann does not even disclose or suggest a report.

Claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-20 depend from claims 1, 9, and 16, respectively, and thereby incorporate the features discussed above by reference. Thus, McCann does not disclose or suggest these claims for the same reasons.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the instant rejection of claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-20 be withdrawn.

C. Rejection of Claims 7 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over McCann in view of Poggi

Claims 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCann in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,569,205 to Poggi (“Poggi”). The Examiner cites Poggi to teach the claim element “check[ing] for cached reports prior to report execution,” as recited in claims 7 and 13. Poggi discloses:

A method and system for report presentation and navigation in a computer system that includes multiple reports about multiple components. The method and system include defining relationships between the multiple reports and the multiple components, and visually representing the relationships on a currently displayed report. The method and system further include visually indicating a position of the currently displayed report among the relationships, thereby reducing user disorientation while navigating through the multiple reports.

Poggi Abstract.

McCann does not disclose or suggest claims 1 and 9 for the reasons discussed above. Poggi does not remedy the deficiencies of McCann. Thus, the combination of McCann and Poggi similarly fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 9. Claims 7 and 13 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. Thus, the combination of McCann and Poggi fails to disclose or suggest claims 7 and 13.

Furthermore, the combination of McCann and Poggi is improper. There is no motivation to combine Poggi with the teachings of McCann because McCann does not disclose a “report” or, as the Office Action admits, “report execution.” Office Action, p. 4.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the instant rejection of claims 7 and 13 be withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

For all the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. Any amendments are supported by the specification. Applicants accordingly submit that these claims are in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

This response is submitted within the three month shortened statutory period for reply. Therefore, no extension of time fees are necessary. Authorization is hereby granted to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 50-0206 for any fees or credits, including any extra claims fee.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Date: 3/15/05

By: Thomas D. Bradshaw
Thomas D. Bradshaw
Registration No. 51,492

for Brian Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (Telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (Facsimile)